

RECEIVED

MAY 02 2001

[10191/538]



TO 3600 MAIL ROOM

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

#17 Reply  
Brief

In re Application of:

Marko MASCHEK et al.

-x

: Examiner: J. Louis Jacques

For: PROCESS FOR GENERATING COLLISION  
SIGNALS

:

:

:

:

:

Filed: November 4, 1997

: Art Unit: 3661

Serial No.: 08/963,720

:

:

:

This correspondence is being deposited with the  
United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope  
addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington,  
D.C. 20231, on

Date 4/26/01

Signature

U.S. Patent  
AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Assistant Commissioner  
for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**REPLY BRIEF PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.193(b)**

SIR:

Appellants submit the present Reply Brief in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed February 27, 2001 ("the Answer"). Although not required, two duplicate copies of this Reply Brief are also being submitted herewith as a courtesy to the Patent Office.

For the reasons set forth below and in the Appeal Brief mailed on September 25, 2000, the final rejections of claims 1-3 should be reversed.

**REMARKS**

From the Answer and previous Office Actions, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner is misconstruing the recitation in the claims of the term "transmission function". According to claim 1, the pattern in time of the individual segments of the crash signal is to be simulated for each, by such a transmission function. The transmission function then functionally simulates the pattern of each crash segment. If the individual transmission functions are combined, this yields the overall transmission function which, as a sum of the individual transmission functions, functionally describes the pattern in time of the crash signal. Such transmission functions per se, therefore, reflect the output variable, namely the